

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are all the claims pending in the application.

I. Drawings

The Examiner still has not indicated whether the drawings filed with the application on September 7, 2003 have been accepted. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner acknowledge such acceptance in the next PTO communication.

II. Response to Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Kondo et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,403,215) in view of Murata et al (2001/005,678). Further, claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Kondo et al in view of Murata et al, Carfagna et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,779,976) and Dreher (U.S. Pat. No. 3,342,325).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for the following reasons.

Murata et al. relates to “a heat-peelable pressure-sensitive adhesive sheet” characterized by a mechanism of peeling the sheet by decreasing its adhesive force by means of heating. On the other hand, Kondo et al. relates to “a pressure-sensitive adhesive composition” characterized by a mechanism of peeling a pressure-sensitive adhesive sheet using the pressure-sensitive adhesive composition by decreasing adhesive force of the pressure-sensitive adhesive composition by means of emitting an energy beam.

Murata et al. and Kondo et al. are substantially different in the mechanism of decreasing the adhesive force from each other. When focusing on the means for decreasing the adhesive force, the decrease of the adhesive force by heating is quite different in technical means from the decrease of the adhesive force by emitting an energy beam. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have considered the solution for improving peelability related to a heat-peelable pressure-sensitive adhesive sheet when dealing with a pressure-sensitive adhesive sheet peelable by means of emitting an energy beam. That is, there is no motivation to combine Murata et al. and Kondo et al.

Moreover, the present invention relates to a dust cleaner having tackiness. Accordingly, the present invention is quite different from Murata et al. and Kondo et al. In order to develop the dust cleaning performance, it is necessary that the pressure-sensitive adhesive layer maintains the tackiness even after expanding thermally expandable microspheres. Thus, the present invention is fundamentally different in the above point from Murata et al., which only describes that the sheet is peeled by decreasing the adhesive force by heating.

Further, Carfagna et al and Dreher do not rectify the deficiencies of Kondo et al in view of Murata et al.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims are not obvious over the cited references and thus the rejections should be withdrawn.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Fang Liu
Registration No. 51,283

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 20, 2006